

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	County of Monterey	Amount Requested	\$7,475,000
------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	-------------

Proposal Title	Lower Carmel River Floodplain Protection and Enhancement Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$18,310,032
-----------------------	--	----------------------------	--------------

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Lower Carmel River Floodplain Restoration and Enhancement Project will be completed on the 131-acre historic floodplain located just upstream of the Carmel River Lagoon and east of Highway One on land known as the Odello fields. There are two phases: 1) Phase one will include the grading and creation of the 36-acre agricultural preserve out of the 100-year floodplain and the public trail; 2) Phase two of the project will include the construction of the flood conveyance causeway, removal of the south bank levees, regrading of the east edge of the Odello property, and continued restoration plantings.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	6/12
Budget	2/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	0/12
Schedule	1/5	Program Preferences	0/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	5/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			23

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The Work Plan criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. For example, it is unclear what tasks will be completed as part of this proposal. Page 4 of the Work Plan includes a list of tasks proposed for IRWM funding including Tasks 1 - 4 (Task 1: Project Management, Task 2: Earthwork and Grading, Task 3: Construction of Conveyance Causeway, and Task 4: Restoration Activities). However, immediately following the list of tasks is a table that includes 10 tasks with six stated to be "part of the IRWM Grant." These six tasks (Task 1-Project Management, Task 5-CEQA/NEPA for Causeway, Task 6-Permitting, Task 8-Causeway Construction and Habitat Restoration, Task 9-Plantings and Invasive Control, and Task 10-Post-Project Monitoring) do not match the four tasks mentioned above. The list of tasks in the table more closely resembles the tasks identified in the Budget

and Schedule, but they are not identical. Other deficiencies in the Work Plan include: deliverables to DWR are not discussed; plans for the construction task are insufficient; specifications are not provided; and scientific and technical documentation, which are referenced, are not provided nor summarized.

Budget

The Budget in the Proposal has detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking for all of the Budget categories described in Exhibit B. Tasks do not match the Work Plan and subtasks are too broad, with little indication as to quantity or what work will be performed. No supporting documentation is provided to validate cost estimates (e.g., hours estimate, labor rates, or material cost breakdown). The Applicant's grant request of \$7,475,016 is identical to the funding match; however, the Applicant also includes "Other State Funds Being Used." This reduces the funding match to 41%. Other State Funds are the entire funding source for Project Admin, CEQA/NEPA, and Final Design.

Schedule

The Schedule does not follow the work items presented in the Work Plan and Budget, is clearly not reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation more than 12 months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). The Schedule does not follow the work items presented in the Work Plan and Budget. The Schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation more than 12 months after the estimated grant award date. Also, the lack of construction subtasks and milestones makes reasonableness difficult to determine and the time for Environmental, Engineering, and Permits appears excessive (660 days or 22 months).

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Targets appear realistic and output and outcome indicators should effectively track project output and performance.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits

Average levels of Flood Damage Reduction Benefits can be realized through this Proposal; however, the quality of the analysis and/or supporting documentation was unsubstantiated. In particular, no inundation map is provided. The Application mentions a "Flood Elevation Projection Map;" however, this map is not included. No annual damages are estimated for post-project conditions. Annual damages were only given for "without project" conditions. Attachment 7 does not include any of the tables requested in the PSP. No net present value of costs or claimed benefits is provided in the text. Useful information on historical and annualized damages is provided, but the benefits and costs cannot readily be compared. No Water Supply Benefits are claimed.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

This criterion is not addressed. No Economic Analysis of Water Quality or Other Expected Benefits is included in the Application.

Program Preferences

This criterion is not addressed as the Applicant did not include Attachment 11 (Program Preferences). The Applicant included a cover sheet for Attachments 8 – 12 that states “The project does not qualify as a water supply or water quality project; therefore, the following attachments are not applicable: Attachments 8 – 12.” Regardless, the Project could have flood damage reduction, water quality, and other benefits, and the Applicant should have included most of these Attachments.